

OPINION 1871

Iodotropheus sprengerae Oliver & Loiselle, 1972 (Osteichthyes, Perciformes): holotype replaced by a neotype

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Osteichthyes; CICHLIDAE; rusty cichlid; *Iodotropheus sprengerae*; Lake Malawi.

Ruling

- (1) Under the plenary powers all previous fixations of type specimens for the nominal species *Iodotropheus sprengerae* Oliver & Loiselle, 1972 are hereby set aside and the male specimen PSU 2721 in the Fish Museum, The Pennsylvania State University, U.S.A. is designated as the neotype.
- (2) The name *Iodotropheus* Oliver & Loiselle, 1972 (gender: masculine), type species by monotypy *Iodotropheus sprengerae* Oliver & Loiselle, 1972, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.
- (3) The name *sprengerae* Oliver & Loiselle, 1972, as published in the binomen *Iodotropheus sprengerae* and as defined by the neotype designated in (1) above (specific name of the type species of *Iodotropheus* Oliver & Loiselle, 1972), is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 2955

An application to replace the holotype of *Iodotropheus sprengerae* Oliver & Loiselle, 1972 with a neotype was received from Prof Jay R. Stauffer, Jr. (*The Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*) on 18 October 1994. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 52: 321–323 (December 1995). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals.

It was noted on the voting papers that the holotype and paratypes of *Iodotropheus sprengerae* (para. 1 of the application) were presented to the Natural History Museum, London, by M. Oliver and P. Loiselle and were all entered in the fish specimen register as 'Aquarium raised'.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 1996 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 52: 323. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 1997 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes — 18: Bock, Bouchet, Brothers, Cocks, Eschmeyer, Heppell, Kabata, Macpherson, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Mawatari, Minelli, Nielsen, Nye, Papp, Patterson, Schuster, Song

Negative votes — 5: Dupuis, Kraus, Lehtinen, Savage and Štys.

Kerzhner abstained.

No vote was received from Cogger.

Ride was on leave of absence.

Voting against, Dupuis commented that it would have been preferable to change the type species of the genus rather than the holotype of the existing type species. Savage commented: 'It appears that the type material of *Iodotropheus sprengerae*

could well represent a species not subsequently collected'. Štys commented: 'I consider that this case is premature. The taxonomy has not been sorted out and there is always a possibility that the original wild population of *I. sprengerae* will be found. There are several possible methods for recognizing if the holotype is really a hybrid'. Abstaining, Kerzhner commented: 'Although the differences of the type series of *Iodotropheus sprengerae* from the wild specimens very probably are explained by hybridization, other explanations, including that they belong to a separate species or population, seem possible'.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Iodotropheus Oliver & Loisele, 1972, *Revue de Zoologie et de Botanique Africaines*, **85**(3-4): 310.

sprengerae, *Iodotropheus*, Oliver & Loisele, 1972, *Revue de Zoologie et de Botanique Africaines*, **85**(3-4): 310.